REMARKS

Applicants respectfully request reconsideration of this application. No claims have been added or canceled in the current response. Claims 1, 60, and 90 have been amended.

Applicants reserve all rights with respect to the applicability of the Doctrine of Equivalents.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e)

Claims 1-3 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,036,100 of Asami ("Asami").

Claim 1 as amended sets forth first circuitry configured to receive a first enable signal from a portable smart card enabler device, *wherein the first enable signal is transmitted to the first circuitry without passing through the smart card reader*. In contrast, Asami fails to disclose at least the above limitation. In the Office Action, the Examiner analogized the host computer 11 in the host system apparatus 2 to be the portable smart card enabler device and the data reader/writer 12 as the smart card reader (Office Action, p. 2, last paragraph, ln. 2-3). According to Asami, the host system apparatus 2 continuously outputs an RF signal from reader/writer 12 to the IC card 1 (Asami, col. 4, ln. 5-10). Asami further discloses that when data is transmitted from reader/writer 12 to IC card 1, reader/writer controller 15 instructs modem circuit unit 14 to modulate the data from host computer 11 according to host computer command, and causes the modulated data to then be transmitted from transmission antenna unit 13 (Asami, col. 4, ln. 18-26). In other words, the data from the host computer 11 (which the Examiner analogized as the portable smart card enabler device in claim 1) is transmitted to the IC card 1 through the data reader/writer 12 (which the Examiner analogized as the smart card reader in claim 1) in the

system disclosed by Asami. Therefore, Asami fails to disclose at least the limitation of the first enable signal from the portable smart card enabler device is transmitted to the first circuitry of the smart card without passing through the smart card reader. For at least this reason, Asami fails to anticipate claim 1 as amended. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 2-3 and 7-9 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1. Therefore, Asami fails to anticipate claims 2-3 and 7-9 for at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome.

Rejections Under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claim 6 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Patent No. 6,036,100 of Asami ("Asami") in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,180,902 of Schick et al. ("Schick"). Claim 6 depends indirectly from claim 1, and hence, includes the limitations of claim 1 as amended. As discussed above, Asami fails to disclose at least the limitation set forth above. Furthermore, Schick fails to make up the deficiency in Asami. Therefore, a combination of Asami and Schick fails to disclose every limitation in claim 6. For at least this reason, claim 6 is patentable over Asami in view of Schick. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 10-12 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Patent No. 6,036,100 of Asami ("Asami") in view of U.S. Patent No. 4,973,828 of Naruse et al. ("Naruse"). Claims 10-12 depend, directly or indirectly, from claim 1, and hence, include the limitations of claim 1 as amended. As discussed above, Asami fails to disclose at least the limitation set forth above. Furthermore, Naruse fails to make up the deficiency in Asami. Therefore, a combination of Asami and Naruse fails to disclose every limitation in

claims 10-12. For at least this reason, claims 10-12 are patentable over Asami in view of Naruse. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejection has been overcome.

Claims 60-69 and 90-96 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over U.S. Patent No. Patent No. 6,036,100 of Asami ("Asami") in view of EP Patent No. 0,949,593 of Kawan et al. ("Kawan") and U.S. Patent No. 4,973,828 of Naruse et al. ("Naruse").

For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claim 1, Asami fails to disclose every limitation in claims 60 and 90 as amended. Furthermore, neither Kawan nor Naruse make up the deficiencies in Asami. Therefore, a combination of Asami, Kawan, and Naruse fails to disclose every limitation in claims 60 and 90. For at least this reason, claims 60 and 90 are patentable over Asami in view of Kawan and Naruse. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome.

Claims 61-69 and 91-96 depend, directly or indirectly, from claims 60 and 90, respectively. For at least the reason discussed above with respect to claims 60 and 90, claims 61-69 and 91-96 are patentable over Asami in view of Kawan and Naruse. Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome.

CONCLUSION

Applicants respectfully submit that the rejections have been overcome.

If there are any additional charges not covered by any check submitted, please charge Deposit Account No. 02-2666.

Respectfully submitted,

BLAKELY, SOKOLOFF, TAYLOR & ZAFMAN LLP

Date: December 8, 2004

Chui-kiu Teresa Wong
Attorney for Applicants
Reg. No. 48,042

12400 Wilshire Boulevard
Seventh Floor
Los Angeles, California 90025-1026
(408) 720-8300